

Appl. No. 10/825,919  
Amdt. Dated December 8, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of November 4, 2008

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. By this amendment, Applicant has modified each of the independent claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections by clarifying the claimed subject matter of the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the modified claims comport with all of the requirements of section 112 and accordingly Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under section 112.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully resubmits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants presently claimed invention. Applicant notes that the presently claimed invention is directed to systems and methods for inserting an electrolytic solution into a container that is secured to a rotating turntable. Under rotation, a centrifugal force is exerted on the electrolytic solution which is dropped to an open end portion of the electrolytic solution containing portion of each solar cell device in the preferred exemplary embodiment.

This is described in the first full paragraph on page 17 beginning at line number 4. As described therein, under the action of the centrifugal force, the electrolytic solution flows toward the depth of the electrolytic solution containing portion to be distributed throughout the electrolytic solution

Appl. No. 10/825,919  
Amdt. Dated December 8, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of November 4, 2008

containing structure.

Applicant notes that the specification explicitly states that the electrolytic solution 5 is "dropped to the one end portion 4a of the electrolytic solution" container. At this point, because the electrolytic solution container is secured to the turntable, the solution flows into the container. Applicant submits that the previous claim language was appropriate however, for the sake of clarification, Applicant has modified each of the independent claims to specify that the "electrolytic solution (is positioned - dropped) between the center and the opening of the vessel while" the turntable is rotated.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references of record, whether considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest this advance in the art. Indeed it is only Applicant's instant disclosure which provides the indication that the use of centrifugal force can be used specifically for transferring the electrolytic solution into the container. In contrast, the prior art Park reference merely describes an apparatus for filling a battery with an electrolyte that includes an electrolyte feeding unit which is pivotally mounted on the body and an electrolyte filling port that is slidably installed within each of the longitudinal holes of the case receiving unit.

As described in this reference, when the rotation speed of the body reaches a predetermined speed, the filling port overcomes the biasing force of the bias member and slides down towards the case so that the filling nozzle is opened. When the rotation speed of the body is less than the predetermined

Appl. No. 10/825,919  
Amdt. Dated December 8, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of November 4, 2008

speed, the filling nozzle is closed by the valve and accordingly the electrolyte in the filling port does not leak outside. See, for example, the Abstract of the disclosure. Accordingly, in contrast with prior art, Applicant positions the electrolyte between the center of the rotating table and the opening by simply dropping the solution to this location.

In contrast with the present invention, the prior art does not teach this convenient approach to filling the vessel by simply dropping the solution to a location in front of the opening so that the centrifugal force may be used to insert the electrolytic solution into the vessel.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3891.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/8/08

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke  
**ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS, LLC.**  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5450  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Tel. (312) 277-2006  
**Attorney for Applicants**